

composition is added to the sulfur-containing hydrocarbon to be treated. Nevertheless, the person having ordinary skill in the art would recognize that any suitable means could be used, be it by pouring (i.e. "batch introducing step"), by pumping the composition through a pipe, or other "chemical tool," "coiled tubing," or "capillary coiled tubing (CCT)."

Applicants have incorporated the allowable subject matter of claim 2 into claims 1, 18, 28 and 31, rendering this rejection moot. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner contends as follows:

22. With respect to claim 35, Yon-Hin discloses a sulfur scavenging composition comprising a solution including from about 5 wt.% to about 50 wt.% of the adducts, the remainder being a solvent (see Yon-Hin, page 4, lines 14-16).

Applicants have incorporated the allowable subject matter of claim 2 into claims 1, 18, 28 and 31, rendering this rejection moot. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner states as follows:

23. Claims 2-6, 19, and 23-26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

24. The following is Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

With respect to claims 2-6, 19, and 23-26, Yon-Hin does not disclose or suggest a method of reducing or substantially eliminating a noxious sulfur-containing species in a fluid, the method comprising contacting the fluid with a composition comprising substantially monomeric aldehyde-amine adducts as defined by formulas (I) and (II) of Applicant's claims 2 and 19, "where the CH_2R groups are derived from at least one aldehyde" (see Applicant's claims 2 and 19). In contrast, the composition disclosed by Yon-Hin is an adduct containing terminal CH_2R groups derived from the amine reactant and thus not "derived from at least one aldehyde" as required by Applicant's claims 2 and 19 (from which claims 3-6 and 23-26 respectively depend). Thus, Applicant's claims 2-6, 19, and 23-26 are patentable over Yon-Hin.

Applicants acknowledge and thank the Examiner.

Response to Arguments

The Examiner states as follows:

25. Applicant's arguments filed 6 March 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

26. Examiner understands Applicant's principal arguments to be:

- I. Yon-Hin does not disclose an aldehyde-amine adduct comprising a reaction of a single aldehyde and a single amine.
- II. Yon-Hin relates to compositions comprising two amines linked together by at least two aldehyde derived units.

27. With respect to Applicant's first argument, Yon-Hin very clearly discloses an aldehyde-amine adduct (for example, "1,w-bis-[N,N-dibutylamino]-poly(methyleneoxy)-methylene") formed from the

